

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-25 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claims 3, 11, 18, and 24 have been cancelled through this Reply. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-17, 19-23, and 25 are currently pending of which claims 1, 9, 16, and 22 are independent. Claims 1, 9, 13-16, and 22 have been amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

OBJECTION TO THE TITLE

The Examiner objects to the title of the invention as allegedly being not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title to address this issue. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that the limitation "the first keyboard" recited in claim 13, "the first keyboard housing" recited in claim 14, and "the second keyboard housing" recited in claims 13-15 lack sufficient antecedent bases in the claims. Claims 13-15 have been amended to depend from claim 9. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no insufficient antecedent basis for the above-identified limitation in amended claims 13-15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 13-15 be withdrawn.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

The Examiner rejects claims 3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra (US Patent 6,317,061) [hereinafter "Batra"], in view of Salmon (Pub.

No. 2003/0048256) [hereinafter "Salmon"], and further in view of Mcloone (US 6,986,614) [hereinafter "Mcloone"].

The Examiner also rejects claims 11 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon and Lin (US 6,529,145) [hereinafter "Lin"], and further in view Mcloone.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mcloone does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and 103(c) for the following reasons.

In order to evidence the establishment of common ownership of the Mcloone patent and the present application, reference is made to the Macloone patent cover page and the records of the present application which both show an assignment to Microsoft Corporation. It is further confirmed from Applicants that Microsoft Corporation indeed owned the rights to the inventions of both the Mcloone patent and the present application at the time these inventions were made. It is submitted that this complies with *M.P.E.P.* 706.02(1)(2). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted to remove Mcloone as prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTION – Batra, Salmon, Mcloone, Cheng, Lin,

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 13-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra (US Patent 6,317,061)[hereinafter "Batra"], in view of Salmon (Pub. No. 2003/0048256)[hereinafter "Salmon"]. Applicants respectfully traverse.

For a Section 103 rejection to be proper, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must be established. See *M.P.E.P.* 2142. One requirement to establish *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all claim limitations. See *M.P.E.P.* 2142; *M.P.E.P.* 706.02(j). Thus, if the cited references fail to teach or suggest one or more elements, then the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Note that claim 3 has been incorporated into independent claim 1 and claim 18 has been incorporated into independent claim 16. As demonstrated above, the Examiner relies on the Mcloone patent to reject claims 3 and 18. Applicants respectfully submit that the Mcloone

patent does not qualify as prior art for the reasons stated above within the section "ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and 16 are not rendered unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon and further in view of Mcloone.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 6-8, 13-15, 17, and 19-21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

Claims 9, 10, 12, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon, and further in view of Lin. Note that claim 11 has been incorporated into independent claim 9 and claim 24 has been incorporated into independent claim 22. As demonstrated above, the Examiner relies on the Mcloone patent to reject claims 11 and 24. Applicants respectfully submit that the Mcloone patent does not qualify as prior art for the reasons stated above within the section "ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 9 and 22 are not rendered unpatentable over Batra in view of Salmon and Lin, and further in view of Mcloone.

Dependent claims 10, 12, and 23 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

Dependent claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon, and further in view of Cheng (US Pub. No. 2003/0174123) [hereinafter "Cheng"] and dependent claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Batra, in view of Salmon and Lin, and further in view of Cheng. These claims are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency on corresponding independent claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment and remarks, it is believed that claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-17, 19-23, and 25 are allowable.

Application No 10/823,600
Amendment dated June 12, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 12, 2007


Docket No : 5486-0172PUS1

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #58,755
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant